



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

JGJR.: 01-06

Paper No: ____

MOORE, HANSEN
& SUMNER, PLLP
225 SOUTH SIXTH ST
MINNEAPOLIS MN 55402

COPY MAILED

JAN 27 2006

OFFICE OF PETITIONS

In re Application of :
Price :
Application No. 10/688,239 :
Filing Date: 17 October, 2003 :
Attorney Docket No. A45-015-01-US :

DECISION

This is a decision on the petition filed on 22 December, 2005, to withdraw the holding of abandonment under 37 C.F.R. §1.181.

For the reasons set forth below, the petition under 37 C.F.R. §1.181 is **GRANTED**.

BACKGROUND

The record reflects that:

- it appeared that Petitioner failed to reply timely and properly to the non-final Office action mailed on 9 June, 2005, with reply due absent extension of time on or before 9 September, 2005;
- the application went abandoned after midnight 9 September, 2005;
- the Office mailed the Notice of Abandonment on 16 December, 2005—however, therein the Office erroneously stated the mail date of the Office action as 31 May, 2005;
- on 22 December, 2005, Petitioner filed the instant petition, evidencing therewith what are averred to be true copies of, *inter alia*, the transmittal—over a (Friday) 9 December, 2005,

certificate of mailing—of the reply to the Office action (in the form of an amendment), a request and fee for a three- (3-) month extension of time and the date-stamped (“OIPE DEC 12 2005”) receipt card.

STATUTES, REGULATIONS AND ANALYSIS

Congress has authorized the Commissioner to "revive an application if the delay is shown to the satisfaction of the Commissioner to have been "unavoidable." 35 U.S.C. §133 (1994).¹

The regulations at 37 C.F.R. §1.137(a) and (b) set forth the requirements for a petitioner to revive a previously unavoidably or unintentionally, respectively, abandoned application under this congressional grant of authority. The language of 35 U.S.C. §133 and 37 C.F.R. §1.137(a) is clear, unambiguous, and without qualification: the delay in tendering the reply to the outstanding Office action, as well as filing the first petition seeking revival, must have been unavoidable for the reply now to be accepted on petition.²

Delays in responding properly raise the question whether delays are unavoidable.³ Where there is a question whether the delay was unavoidable, Petitioners must meet the burden of establishing that the delay was unavoidable within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §133 and 37 C.F.R. §1.137(a).⁴ And the Petitioner must be diligent in attending to the matter.⁵ Failure to do so does not constitute the care required under Pratt, and so cannot satisfy the test for diligence and due care.

(By contrast, unintentional delays are those that do not satisfy the very strict statutory and regulatory requirements of unavoidable delay, and also, by definition, are not intentional.⁶))

¹ 35 U.S.C. §133 provides:

35 U.S.C. §133 Time for prosecuting application.

Upon failure of the applicant to prosecute the application within six months after any action therein, of which notice has been given or mailed to the applicant, or within such shorter time, not less than thirty days, as fixed by the Commissioner in such action, the application shall be regarded as abandoned by the parties thereto, unless it be shown to the satisfaction of the Commissioner that such delay was unavoidable.

² Therefore, by example, an unavoidable delay in the payment of the Filing Fee might occur if a reply is shipped by the US Postal Service, but due to catastrophic accident, the delivery is not made.

³ See: *Changes to Patent Practice and Procedure; Final Rule Notice*, 62 Fed. Reg. at 53158-59 (October 10, 1997), 1203 Off. Gaz. Pat. Office at 86-87 (October 21, 1997).

⁴ See: In re Application of G, 11 USPQ2d 1378, 1380 (Comm'r Pats. 1989).

⁵ See: Diligence in Filing Petitions to Revive and Petitions to Withdraw the Holding of Abandonment, 1124 Off. Gaz. Pat. Office 33 (March 19, 1991). It was and is Petitioner's burden to exercise diligence in seeking either to have the holding of abandonment withdrawn or the application revived. See 1124 Off. Gaz. Pat. Office supra.

⁶ Therefore, by example, an unintentional delay in the reply might occur if the reply and transmittal form are to be prepared for shipment by the US Postal Service, but other pressing matters distract one's attention and the mail is not timely deposited for shipment.

As to a Request to Withdraw
the Holding of Abandonment

Petitioner alleges timely reply to the Office action, and supports the allegation with the above-referenced documentation.

The courts have determined the construct for properly supporting a petition seeking withdrawal of a holding of abandonment.⁷

Petitioner satisfied the showing required under Delgar and thus to be considered under the provisions of 37 C.F.R. §1.181.

CONCLUSION

The petition as considered under 37 C.F.R. §1.181 is **granted** and the Abandonment of 16 December, 2005, having been improvidently entered hereby is withdrawn.

The instant application is released to Technology Center 3600 for further processing in due course.

Telephone inquiries concerning this decision may be directed to the undersigned at (571) 272-3214.



John J. Gillon, Jr.
Senior Attorney
Office of Petitions

⁷ See: Delgar v. Schulyer, 172 USPQ 513 (D.D.C. 1971).